

# ARIZONA HISTORICAL ADVISORY COMMISSION

---

November 29, 2007

## MINUTES

The Arizona Historical Advisory Commission (AHAC) met at **1:30 p.m. on November 29, 2007** at the Arizona State House of Representatives, 1700 W. Washington, in House Hearing Room 1, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. (*Full transcript available on request*).

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Jim Garrison called the meeting to order at 1:36 pm

### **INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Members and guests introduced themselves.

### **Members Present**

Jim Garrison  
State Historic Preservation Office,  
Arizona State Parks

GladysAnn Wells, Director  
Arizona State Library, Archives and Public  
Records

John Driggs, Citizen  
Public Member

Julie Yoder, Executive Director  
Arizona Humanities Council

Ann Dutton Ewbank, President  
Arizona Library Association

Jean Calhoun, Director of Land and Water  
Conservation, The Nature Conservancy

Pam Stevenson on behalf of  
Attorney General Terry Goddard

Linda Yuhas/for Kelly Paisley  
Department of Tourism

Paul Allvin  
Interim V.P. to External Relations  
University of Arizona

Don Ryden  
Ryden Architects

Jay Ziemann, Asst. Director  
Arizona State Parks

The Honorable Steve Tully  
Gordon & Rees, LLP

### **Members Absent**

The Honorable Ken Bennett

Robert Booker, Executive Director  
Arizona Commission on the Arts

Hartman Lomawaima, Director  
Arizona State Museum

Steve Rizley  
Vice President & Region Manager  
Arizona Cox Communications

Beth Vershure  
KAET-TV Channel 8  
Arizona State University

Carol Warren  
Arizona Department of Education

Anne Woosley, Executive Director  
Arizona Historical Society

Catherine May  
Senior Historical Analyst/Archivist Salt River  
Project

Noel J. Stowe, Chair/Professor of History  
Arizona State University

### **Guests**

Mayor Jim Cavanaugh, City of Goodyear

Shelley Cohn, 9-11 Commission

Laurie Hillebrands, City of Goodyear Staff

Bill Boyd, Senate Research

*Other guests were present but did not sign in.*

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY PAUL ALLVIN AND SECONDED BY JEAN CALHOUN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2007 MEETING. MOTION CARRIED.**

### **PRESENTATION BY CITY OF GOODYEAR**

On behalf of the Commission, Mr. Driggs introduced Mayor Jim Cavanaugh, City of Goodyear and his assistant Laurie Hillebrands and announced that the City of Goodyear was the first city to step up under the concept that cities and towns would provide matching funds for a legislative appropriation two sessions ago.

Mayor Jim Cavanaugh, City of Goodyear, thanked Mr. Driggs for all his help noting that he had informed them of this opportunity. Mr. Cavanaugh announced that the citizens of Goodyear would like to celebrate the greatness of the history of Arizona and that they have established the Arizona Centennial Committee for Goodyear. He noted that there has been a tremendous response from their citizens and that they expect to get that underway very soon. He presented a check in the amount of \$47,548.00 to the Commission, noting that it is a nice sum, but it's just a small part of what we are going to need.

### **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE AND ACTIVITY REPORT**

Mr. Garrison reported that he has been in contact with Tom Smith of the Capitol Mall Association and there will be an agenda item dealing with new language that will be associated with the 911 Memorial coming up on the agenda.

He has also been in touch with Al Richman who is developing the Arizona State Railroad Museum up in Williams, which is one of our first legacy projects approved by the Commission. He has been given an ADOT federal highways enhancement grant and since it is federal money, he is very interested in having that federal money count towards the match. Mr. Garrison sent him some information and he may have been in touch with Juanita as to who's in charge of processing the money. There may be a meeting in the future between ADOT and the Commission as to how federal enhancement money in projects that are official legacy projects will be developed into credible accounting for the match.

Earlier in the week the Chairman, Jim Garrison met with the Agricultural Department and we'll hear from Don Ryden shortly about what's going on with the Register of Heritage Agriculture.

Mike Braun has advised Mr. Garrison that the Legislative Council will be meeting next Monday morning here at the Capitol and the Chairman, Jim Garrison was asked to attend that meeting. Hopefully we can get some clarification from the Legislative Council on defining how the two and a half million dollars would be utilized from their perspective and or some recommendations of what changes could be made to make the two and a half million dollars more available either to the Commission or to legacy projects.

Mr. Garrison asked GladysAnn Wells to give an overview of the Capitol Task Force meeting on November 28, 2007.

Ms. Wells: This was a group established through the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. There are four of us from this Commission appointed to this task force—Mr. Garrison, Mr. Driggs, Director of the Historical Society Ann Woosley and myself. The current charge of the task force in a nutshell is to evaluate the structural stability, mechanics and so forth of the 1901 State Capitol Museum; to see if it could be repatriated into a larger participation of legislative and other high level governmental business. There is a terrible space problem here on the Capital Mall and at least the questions have to be asked about the viability of that building given its wonderful placement right in the middle of things whether or not it could serve a different set of functions. The task force heard from a structural engineer, an architectural firm, Mr. Garrison from an historical preservation point of view, and from me as the Director of the Agency in charge of the programs of the State Capitol Museum about what the current situation is. Fortunately, with the restorations that have been invested in the 70's when it was put on the historic register of the National Register for Historic Places and more recently in the late 90's, the building is structurally sound. It's in better shape than the current House and Senate buildings. The Capitol Task Force will meet again on December 11 at 1:30 p.m. and again on December 20. If anyone would like to come, the agenda does allow for public comment.

Mr. Garrison: The charge that I was given at the meeting yesterday was to look at the question as to whether the special analysis and the needs of the Capitol could be tied to the Centennial, and whether or not this type of project could be considered as a signature statewide legacy project. It just so happened that in 1974 there was a similar task force committee formed to make recommendations on the restoration of the Capitol once the Executive Tower was constructed behind the Capitol. During the museum functions at that time, there was an idea of a visitor center and support offices going into the Capitol restoration project. That started because of the U.S. Bicentennial event in '76 and there was a connection between a major national event and the impetus to restore the Capitol. I think it is somewhat interesting that there's this push now with the special needs around the Capitol to look at the Capitol Complex and what might be a signature project for the celebration of the centennial. I think that connection is good in wanting to give a sense that this is an event that can be celebrated with a signature project. Over the last few years we've been very insistent that the legislature be connected to the centennial and we've brought them into the issue by announcing the plan. Mr. Garrison stressed the importance of articulation with the legislature on a signature legacy project.

Mr. Driggs added that Chairman Garrison did an outstanding job of explaining the criteria for legacy projects. He was eloquent and spoke to each one of the criteria. He thinks the stage will be set for the three heads of state to at some point proclaim that the restoration of the Capitol is the signature focal point project for the Arizona Centennial.

Ms. Wells commented for the record that one of the principal considerations of the task force also applies very strongly to our legacy criteria. That is that the Historical Capitol is now an educational and cultural institution. It is impossible to know at this point whether or not as plans unfold that the educational mission would continue. The Historic Capitol is the artifact that is the backdrop, stage and the most important teaching tool for the entire historic educational program of the State Capitol Museum. Ms. Wells was very gratified that in all the discussion yesterday, both the building and the State Capitol Museum was revered and considered important to maintain its integrity and its beauty.

The teaching educational mission of the State Capitol Museum was considered an important component of anything that be decided and Ms. Wells stated that “you maybe a little premature Mr. Driggs in assuming that those problems have yet been addressed or ironed out. I do think that if the President and Speaker give a larger a charge, it might give a little bit better backdrop. One of the essential issues is that there is a very big difference between observation of a historical artifact and education using an historical artifact. Education must be interactive and not merely observatory and I think that was part of the discussion as well”.

In response, Mr. Driggs commented that his letter of appointment very carefully lists the charges and he thinks we must underscore what GladysAnn just said about considering how the present museum characteristic in use can be maintained in alteration of the uses of the Capitol. The museum and apparently the educational factor was actually part of the formal charge transmitted by the President and the Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Garrison invited members to visit the Historical Advisory Commission Centennial Planning Office located on the ground floor of the rotunda of the Capitol. He expressed appreciation to Linda Dern and Juanita Cason for keeping the Commission organized.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Register of Heritage Agriculture—Don Ryden**

Mr. Ryden: It has been my pleasure as a member of the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee to serve with Mr. Garrison in making arrangements with the Agricultural Department in establishing their Arizona Registry for Heritage Agriculture. We’ve been working on this since September and this register is a wonderful adjunct to complimenting the State Register of Historic Places. It’s not to be confused with another register for places and it took me a while to figure it out. The Department of Agriculture is honoring the families who have maintained their ownership and operation of farms, ranches, and dairies in our state for a period of greater than fifty years. Over the past months the Department of Agriculture and the State Historic Preservation Office have been closely working together in developing all the nemeses of making this kind of a program work. They’ve figured out how one applies for a listing on the Arizona Register of Heritage Agriculture; how its reviewed and evaluated to determine which properties and which families are eligible for this honor; a method of notifying the family of its listing; and the idea of having a certificate or a plaque which would be presented to the family for that listing. Also, the idea of maintaining this list and determining how to go about doing an annual application to be assured that the family does still hold that property. Finally, there will be a methodology for the department to grant its approval for the proper use of the designation as being listed on the Register of Heritage Agriculture. These things together with an application form which was filled out by Doctor Bill Collins from the State Preservation Office have been established. The meeting that Jim and I had with Brett Cameron, Tiffany Ground and Ed Hermes of Agricultural Department determined that there was some more homework that needed to be done. That would include a need to revise the AHAC bi-laws, to add review procedures and the coordination of this register with the Arizona Agricultural Protections Committee. The triple staff will gladly get the preliminary eligibility ruling on those properties in terms of the actual register and state register eligibility as a historic property. We need to have triple work on a memorandum of understanding and work on the bi-laws in order to make this all move forward smoothly. The Department of Agriculture will be working to process a website and a fee that will make this whole process run smoothly and expeditiously. The SHPO is going to be looking up in its files any family owned ranches that may already be listed on the national register so that they might be some of the first people that apply. That is what we have come up with thus far and that’s the homework coming across. I hope to be done with that very shortly, putting this whole program into motion.

Mr. Garrison: Hopefully by the next meeting, this paperwork will be established. We have some additional items with the Commission's bi-laws. The Commission will actually make the final vote on these applications from the recommendations from the Department of Agriculture. I don't know if you recall at our last meeting there was the question as to who should administer this program. I'm thankful that the Department of Agriculture stepped up and said we'd be happy to administer the program and feed you the nominations after we process them through a review committee on their part. I've started to draft out what might be an inter-agency agreement. The Commission isn't really a state agency, we are under Library and Archives and the State Historic Preservation Officer is under the State Parks Board. There are other players that we have to get involved for their approval of a list of items and who's responsible for what part of the process. I thought it was a very positive meeting. Tiffany Ground is an employee of the Department of Agriculture but is in a leadership training program and has undertaken this project as her leadership training project. It's interesting that she did not have to choose a project inside the Department Agriculture but she got very interested in trying to put all these things in place and establishing a website dealing with the registry.

Ms. Wells: I think you have done a great deal of work on this and I think that is wonderful, I however remain concerned that the Legislative Council may have to review anything you come up with because I still have the nagging fear that this maybe too simple a solution. I think AHAC has this responsibility by law and I just want to make sure that we have all our T's crossed.

#### **Centennial Legacy Project Matching Funds—Juliana Yoder**

Ms. Yoder: You will recall at the last meeting there was a question that came up of whether we have looked into using the funds that are part of the legacy projects towards the match to help release the money from the Legislature. We had not done any investigation at that point. Catherine May and I had agreed to meet to look into it and to bring recommendations back to you. You have a summary review of the legacy projects (handout) including the total budget that was presented at the time that their applications were reviewed and whether or not we think that some of those funds might be eligible for a match. It became quickly apparent that there are really two problems. One is the whole process for certifying the match. For instance, the City of Chandler with a thirteen million dollar budget. To funnel some of that money through the state treasury so that we can claim it as match is cumbersome to say the least. The other problem is who's going to do this because each project has its own budget and the budgets are made up from different components. We need someone to sit down with the project director to go over the budget and say okay, this part might be eligible, are you willing to go through the process. We don't see that as part of the programs committee charge. It's time consuming but obviously very important because if you look at the amounts that have already committed to the centennial projects, the match could be there. We did draft a letter that we think should go to the project directors' of the projects that have already been designated and also to the projects that will be designated in the future that explains the current process. We would hope that there might be a way that we could use some sort of a paper certification to create a category for legacy projects that would be different from simply donors to the centennial. I'd be happy to answer any questions or hear your comments.

In response to a question from Ms. Calhoun about whether there is a clear criterion for what it would take for the monies to count towards the match, Ms Wells stated that it is under the province of Legislative Council and it was noted that the criteria has not been developed by Legislative Council as yet.

Mr. Garrison stated that having this information in front of us will go a long way to pleading our case with Legislative Council that it's time that they need to give us some direction or seek changes to the rule or the stature or whatever we need to do. We are assuming that this is only the beginning of legacy projects. The states commitment towards official legacy projects will greatly exceed the

amount of money that has been set aside. We need to determine how we can get from here to there to show the willingness of others to support legacy projects.

Ms. Calhoun asked if Legislative Council has requested recommendations from us on the criteria.

Mr. Garrison responded not as yet but we're optimistic that we are on their radar screen.

Mr. Driggs said before any such letters go out, we should wait until we explore that whole process at the meeting because who knows, there may even be some changes.

Mr. Garrison said yes, but we are where we are and there are thirteen approved legacy projects currently and he thinks we should still keep them in the loop and keep communications going with them. We may want to amend the letter slightly to say that we're exploring other alternatives or something like that; but he thinks it is appropriate that we continue the communication.

Mr. Driggs suggested that we not be in any great rush to send that letter out because we haven't even closed the subject yet with the legislature.

Mr. Garrison responded that that meeting (Legislative Council) will happen on Monday and you're saying to wait until we hear what the feedback will be from Legislative Council before issuing the letter.

Ms. Wells asked Ms. Yoder if she could tell her how she decided on the match because there are two projects on here whose determination startled her.

Ms. Yoder said she would have to say it was from her own pool of ignorance that she just made a stab at whether she thought the sources of funding would be eligible for the match. I can definitely be corrected on that, but some of the State Library's funds could be matched.

Ms. Wells noted that they have been talking with our federal funding source about that, so certainly it wouldn't totally be available for match.

Mr. Garrison: The one million dollars for the Arizona Memory Project, that's not just state money?

Wells: No.

Garrison: It's any source of non-state money that is allowable for the match and I think that is a good point.

Ms. Yoder stated that she doesn't think we can take that as a given because as a grant-making organization, for instance the Arizona Humanities Council, we have the authority to give money under certain restrictions and I would not be comfortable with saying yes. The grantee could then turn around and not submit that money to the State of Arizona because that is not a part of the grant agreement.

Mr. Garrison: Right and that specifically points out what one of the problems is with the current methodology of trying to generate the match. I assume everyone around the table is in agreement with whatever the meaningful process of the Legislator was when they set aside the money. Maybe we need a little insight put down on the table on this and, as time has gone by, there have been questions on the level of complexity and confusion over those issues. To the Legislative Council's defense, they have not really addressed this issue specifically in my mind and so I think we have an opportunity to clarify this.

Mr. Driggs said it was my understanding that they will have a very limited and restricted agenda on Monday and that they're not going to make any decisions. He heard they're not going to meet again for maybe another six months and there are a lot of questions to be answered.

Ms. Wells: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Tully, do you have any advice for us as we go forward into that meeting on Monday?

Mr. Tully: Not really, no. I'm a little surprised that they are not going to meet for another six months.

Ms. Wells: As you mentioned Mr. Chairman, this hasn't had to be on their radar screen as yet, but I think we all know why it is so important to maintain accurate and clear public accountability of funds. Certainly the Humanities Council with their money and the Library and Archives with our federal money have had that drilled into our heads. I think that is what the legislation was set up to do, but I think once they understand how the rollout has been a little bit more difficult especially for the universities--maybe Mr. Allvin can speak to this. I know many of the university grants have enough kind of hoops to go through in the university environment without adding another complexity and the university's will be getting funds for major projects that are related to the centennial that may be legacy projects.

Mr. Garrison: It is definitely one of the issues that the Commission has been dealing with and we cannot speak for Legislative Council on what their intent of how that money will be released and the conditions of the match. I think a dialog with them will only help us answer some of the questions and be better in line with our ability to communicate with legacy project proponents as to their wish that there might become funds available for their projects. I think it's in all of our interests to move that forward as far as we can.

#### **Statutes Report/Discussion—GladysAnn Wells/Bill Boyd**

Ms. Wells: I'd like to defer this to Bill Boyd of senate research who is with us this afternoon to discuss the statutory change. He and I have been working with Mr. Garrison to do the first roll out of it and I think Bill is a better expert than I could ever be.

Mr. Boyd: Last session the statutes were changed to give us a path for updating memorials. Prior to that there was no clear statutory procedure to resolve an error found in a monument. Chapter 250 basically outlines the path for building monuments and changing monuments. After a review by this body, the Legislative Governmental Mall Commission either accepts or refuses the changes. However, there is actually no direction as to how it actually gets to this body or other details of the process. The specific section in statute is 41-1364.

Ms. Wells: I'd like to add that this was SB 1114 and became Chapter 250. Sometimes it's a little easier to find it that route when it's in recent legislation. One of the things that Mr. Boyd and I were discussing is while we're looking at our bi-laws; it might be very useful to include a section of implementation for this new responsibility. The Arizona Historical Advisory Commission has always had the responsibility for just the historical accuracy, not the design, not the implantation but the historical accuracy of information put on a monument. Now we have the responsibility for re-checking any changes. I think it would be good to have in our bi-laws who are to receive it, how long of a time period of turn-around should be, could be; how legislative Mall Commission is then informed of the action or the consideration. Those are the kinds of things that I think the Chair of the Legislative Mall Commission, former Senator Smith and Bill and I have been struggling with. There is a slight time delay needed because any historical fact is checked not only by Library and Archives History and Archival staff but also by the Arizona Historical Society staff. They go back to the primary sources; they do not use secondary sources in these things. They go back to as close as they can get to the primary. As you are revising the bi-laws Mr. Chairman you may want to think about this.

Mr. Garrison: The law says “After recommendations from the Historical Advisory Commission regarding what impact the proposed alteration or modification...” which Mr. Boyd, you alluded to that being more than just a text on the monument. Mr. Garrison clarified his understanding that if the monument included a horseman that was supposed to represent a certain dress of a certain period then we would look at that for accuracy. It is the accuracy of what’s being portrayed not the aesthetic design and construction of the monument. Ms. Wells agreed that it is also her understanding that we are responsible for the historical integrity, which would not be limited only to text.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY GLADYSANN WELLS AND SECONDED BY PAUL ALLVIN THAT AS WE REVIEW OUR BYLAWS FOR THE HERITAGE AND AGRICULTURE WORK AS WELL AS SOME COMMITTEE WORK, AS REFLECTED IN THE PAST MINUTES, THAT WE ALSO INCLUDE THE IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERACTION BETWEEN THIS COMMISSION AND THE LEGISLATIVE MALL COMMISSION IN THE CORRECTION OF MONUMENTS. MOTION CARRIED.**

## **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

### **9-11 Memorial**

Mr. Garrison introduced Shelley Cohen and asked her to explain how we came to have these documents in front of us.

Ms. Cohen explained that she is a member of the 9-11 Memorial Commission. Over the last year and a half, the 911 Memorial Commission has reviewed the text that is on the memorial now in the Capitol Mall. We came to the conclusion that there needed to be some kind of introductory panel to the memorial that will explain the context of what the memorial is about. Currently it includes both a combination of actual items as well as opinions that were collected through extensive interviews conducted by the history department at ASU. What we have proposed through our deliberations at the 911 Commission is the language that you have in front of you of two additional panels that will be at the entry to the memorial. One provides the linear descriptive of discussion of the memorial and then a second panel that speaks to the artistic focus and direction of the memorial. Also, as a result of our year of deliberations, it will include other quotes that came forward that the Commission was interested in having integrated at the memorial. The Commission has reviewed this and has done a micro-editing job. We’ve submitted to AHAC and as GladysAnn had mentioned, it has been extensively reviewed for factual correctness. We are here to ask for your approval of the factual accuracy of this text and we will go back to the Legislative Mall Commission with this information.

Ms. Calhoun questioned whether they had the actual final revised text noting that in the fifth paragraph on panel one, the very first sentence doesn’t seem to be complete. It says, “Through the heroic efforts of first responders and volunteer citizens, helped 25,000 people”. How about “Through the heroic efforts, first responders and volunteer citizens helped 25,000 people...” Ms. Cohen agreed.

Ms. Calhoun made reference to the following paragraph where it says “Americans united with patriotism, pride in its country and its freedom”. She suggested that it could say “Americans **were** united” Then on panel two, under artifacts, the third paragraph, in the last sentence we’re talking about the inclusion of a **relic** from each of the three sites of the September 11 attacks helps us in Arizona honor events that happened more than 2,450 miles away. Where it says “the passage of time” I was going to suggest either that we say either transcending the distance or transcending not only the distance but also the passage of time because that whole sentence talks about distance, not time.

Ms. Wells also noted that she is struggling with the document in front of them because she has seen other versions of this. I remember reading in one of the reports from the historic staff when you say,

“It was the worst disaster on American soil”. Actually more people died at Gettysburg and I think somehow we need to say that the attacks were external in the United States. It’s actually not the place where the most people ever in our history died. It’s the place where the most people were killed from the outside.

Mr. Garrison clarified that it is the second sentence of the third paragraph of panel one that is in question.

Ms. Calhoun suggested, “These were the most deadly external attacks on American soil to date”.

Ms Cohen commented that the number that you were referring to, in the next paragraph, “Through their heroic efforts, first-responders and volunteer citizens helped thousands”. She said it was kept more open ended because that’s the sentence that we had a larger number and both of your editors found different numbers but we kept it inclusive enough that it would be covered.

Ms. Wells agreed noting that they found three different records of the numbers of the people rescued in an authoritative account.

In reference to paragraph three, the number 3,000, Mr. Allvin asked if this is a memorial for the ages to come that we are needing to make sure is accurate, is there some reason that we don’t say 2,974? Ms. Cohen responded that there are contradictions as to the exact amount. Ms. Wells noted that the newspaper reports and the 911 Commission have different numbers. To add to that point, Ms. Cohen said the 911 Commission wanted to be precise and have an actual number. We negotiated back and forth with AHAC on trying to find that number and there were so many inconsistencies that we felt like this would be something that would stand up to being more than a specific number.

Mr. Allvin said he feels like it’s a little wishy-washy but I’ll leave it alone. He also feels it is important for people to know it was east coast time when we are standing in Mountain Standard Time. It says “The hijackings began shortly after 8 am...”, I think we should let people know that it was east coast time when we were standing in Mountain Standard Time. My only other thing is that the copy that we got has the three pieces of feedback; are we assuming that these are going to be incorporated?

There was further discussion about whether or not the Commission members were given the correct document. For clarification, Ms. Wells read through the revisions on the 4-pages of documents to confirm that all recommended revisions were noted.

Mr. Ziemann proposed saying, “These were the most deadly **terrorist** attacks on American Soil to date”. The only thing that you really need to eliminate is the Civil War when you’re talking about the 2,000 deaths. If we are talking about terrorist attacks here, which they reference in the first paragraph, that to me is more accurate than external.

Mr. Tully questioned whether we are just being asked if this is historically accurate and the (Legislative Mall) Commission is the one that is actually going to decide. Mr. Garrison said they will take our recommendations as to accuracy and incorporate them as they see fit. Ms. Wells added that it gets a little confusing when you have three Commissions. We have the 911 Commission that has responded to research done by the Historical Society and Library and Archives. Then we have this Commission that has to say that our staff has done the right thing and clarified it. Then we have the Legislative Mall Commission which will look at what the 911 Commission and AHAC are sending to them. Ms. Cohen said that is her understanding as well.

Ms. Wells noted that at one point she felt, and maybe this is what Mr. Tully is saying too, is we were just doing editorial things. But what we are really trying to do is continue to return to the historical

accuracy which is why it is important that we do honor our Civil War Dead by adding those words in. I think we still are on task within our statutory responsibilities. We are now recommending that “these were the most deadly terrorist attacks on American soil to date” and the Legislative Mall Commission will take that under advisement.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the sentence in the fifth paragraph should read, “Through their heroic efforts, first responders and volunteer citizens helped thousands of people evacuate before the buildings collapsed”.

Mr. Allvin asked if we could verify the accuracy that it was 25,000 people. The statement, “one of the greatest rescue efforts in recorded history” means nothing because thousands could be 3,000 or 300,000. Ms. Wells said the 9-11 Commission couldn’t split that hair either and according to our staff, the estimates of the number of people in the World Trade Center buildings compiled by the National Institute of Standards in Technology for the 9-11 Commission were between 16,000 and 418,800. Ms. Cohen noted that there was another report that said 25,000. Mr. Allvin asked whether its 16,000 or 25,000, are we still sure that it is one of the greatest rescue efforts in recorded history? Following additional discussion, it was agreed that it would be more accurate to say, “tens of thousands.”

Mr. Stevenson noted that if we want to get real picky, go back to paragraph two where it says “8 am and...10 am; there should be periods after the a, p and m.

Ms. Wells clarified the language as follows: “Through their heroic efforts, first responders and volunteer citizens helped tens of thousands of people evacuate before the buildings collapsed”. Then on the next paragraph, the fourth sentence down, “Americans were united in patriotism, pride in this country and **in** its freedom”.

In reference to “Photographs of airplanes crashing into the Pentagon, Shanksville and the World Trade Center” Mr. Allvin pointed out that it was noted that there are no photographs of planes crashing into Shanksville, only photographs of the wreckage, so that seems to be historically inaccurate. If you look at the second comment from a historical perspective, “While there are photographs of planes crashing into the Pentagon and the World Trade Center; there are only photos of plane wreckage after the crash in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.” It was agreed that the sentence should read, “Photographs of airplanes crashing into the Pentagon and World Trade Center Towers, as well as crash wreckage in Shanksville, spread through the media”.

Ms. Wells read back the agreed upon language: “Photographs of airplanes crashing into the Pentagon and World Trade Center Towers, as well as crash wreckage in Shanksville, spread through the media”.

Mr. Tully and Mr. Allvin questioned the statement, “Americans united in patriotism, pride in this country and in its freedom”. Mr. Alvin commented that we are assigning motives to their unity and he questions enforcing a rule onto this that might not be entirely accurate.

Mr. Garrison commented that he thinks the memorial is not to be the definitive and complete statement on this event by any means but a given statement at a given point in time.

In response to concerns expressed, Ms. Wells suggested that it might be possible that when we send our report to the Legislative Mall Commission, to shade those sentences that have been discussed here by saying that although they did not contain a fact that we could prove or disprove; the discussion was uncomfortable or whatever words everybody wants.

Mr. Allvin stated that a hundred years from now, they’re going to be reading some of the defining moments in the nation’s history. Are they going to get an accurate understanding of that’s where the

nation was at that moment because I don't exactly know if this passes the hundred test. I think that if our job is to evaluate this for historical accuracy, perhaps errors of omission are something that we need to be as vigilant about as errors of inclusion or even grammar.

To that point Ms. Calhoun responded that it seems like one of the words that are problematic and troubling is "united" which kind of implies that all Americans felt the same way. Instead perhaps we could say "Americans responded with patriotism, pride in this country and in its freedoms". That does not connote that all Americans responded that way but it is true that a large number of them did, which is historically accurate. Ms. Wells reiterated, "Americans responded with a range of emotions including patriotism, pride in this country and in its freedom".

**Ms. Wells: Moving on rapidly to the second page. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Tully, we still haven't done anything with your concern over that last sentence in that paragraph. Would you like it noted for the record that that goes forward to the Legislative Mall Commission?**

**Tully: Sure, that'd be great.**

Ms. Ewbank stated that the difficulty she is having with reviewing these changes is the context in which we are reviewing them. She visited the memorial a number of times and has read the inscriptions as they've been reported in the newspaper but we don't have them in front of us right now. She said it would be really helpful in terms of context if we actually had all of the inscriptions in front of us as we are looking at these panel changes as well. I don't know if anyone else feels that way but just for contextual assistance, no? Ms. Wells concurred while also noting that it is our job to verify the historical facts in front of us.

Ms. Ewbank reiterated that the inscriptions that are on the memorial are apart of the factual and historical records and not having the entire picture of the memorial in front of us is giving her a lot of difficulty in attempting to piece together everything that we're going through.

Mr. Allvin commented that we had mentioned earlier under artifacts, the last sentence of the last line could be changed to "happened more than 2,450 miles away, transcending **distance** and passage of time".

Ms. Wells: The next thing that I have is the request to add the name of the person being quoted: "Let's Roll, Todd Morgan Beamer, passenger on United Flight 93".

Mr. Allvin: Should we say "Rudolph" as in "Rudolph Giuliani" in a formal sense?

Ms. Wells: I don't have an opinion on that but we could recommend that they use "Rudolph".

Mr. Ryden: In the paragraph titled "Artifacts", it states "the inclusion of a relic from each of the three sites...". It puts a connotation in an ecclesiastical context. Would the word "**artifact**" be more logical?

Garrison: The term relic may have other connotations since it is under artifacts; the word artifact isn't used anywhere else.

Ms. Wells: Paralleling Paul's statement earlier, do we want to recommend that it was President George W. Bush as opposed to the other Bush President? I have another question Mr. Chairman, I thought we already had a Patriots Day. Maybe because I'm from Massachusetts and ours is about Bunker Hill.

Mr. Garrison announced that he would entertain a motion that we communicate Ms. Wells' version, as the secretary of the Commission, in documenting the items by the different Commissioners be transmitted over to the Legislative Mall Commission.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY JEAN CALHOUN AND SECONDED BY DON RYDEN TO TRANSMIT THE VERSION THAT MS. WELLS HAS SO CAREFULLY CRAFTED OVER TO THE 9-11 COMMISSION FOR CONSIDERATION TO THE CAPITOL MALL COMMISSION. MOTION CARRIED.**

Ms. Cohen thanked the Commission for their time and effort. Mr. Garrison asked Ms. Cohen to communicate with them the seriousness with which the Commission undertook this venture. Ms. Cohen commented that all of the volunteers who have been involved in the creation of this memorial are deeply committed to doing the best possible memorial on the mall.

Garrison: And I hope that you will communicate with them the seriousness with which the Commission under took this venture.

## **REPORTS:**

### **Historic Sites Review Committee**

Don Ryden handed out a memo which summarized the last Historic Sites Review Committee. It listed seven properties on the state register which were deferred to the national register. The properties included the Phoenix Towers in Phoenix; Canyon Ranch Headquarters in Coconino County; Picture Canyon Archeological Site in Flagstaff; El Encanto state amendment in their historic district in Tucson; E.C Bunch House of Glendale; The Frankenburger House in Tempe; and Our Lady of the Blessed Catholic Church in Miami. In addition we have been studying and considering the accuracy and completeness of a context of the pre-historic Water utilization in Arizona. Finally we got wondrous words that three more properties were listed on the national register: The People's Valley School in Peoples Valley; An amendment enlarging Glendale's Town site; Catlin Court Historic District; and the Heart Store of Sedona.

### **Countdown to Centennial**

GladysAnn Wells said the Quarter Commission has received confirmation from the U.S. Mint that the quarter that we selected and the Governor agreed to and selected from that group has been approved. It is the quarter that has the banner separating the saguaro from the Grand Canyon. We have a meeting planned for December 18 and there is a new Chair to the Commission whose name is Roberta Crow. The Quarter Commission is alive and moving forward, I have not received any information from the Governor's Office about who will take over the Countdown to the Centennial or who will represent that for this group. I have to pursue that.

### **Development**

John Driggs said the system doesn't work very well; he had some theoretical promises from some cities but has heard nothing. Obviously, there is a lot of interest in the funding potential and in the appropriation but the system is just not working because we're not getting any money. It's a shame to have all that money sitting on the shelf.

### **Membership**

**Noel Stowe is teaching class and unable to be present. Jim Garrison reported there are two new member of the commission – Carol Warren from Department of Education and Linda from Department of Tourism**

## **Marketing**

Beth Vershure is sick and not present at the meeting. Jim Garrison stated that Beth is no longer with KAET. People are appointed to the Commission by person and not by their institution even though many of us represent specific institutions

## **TREASURER'S REPORT**

Mr. Garrison noted that one of the two pages of the Treasurer's Report was inadvertently left out of the packets but it was being handed out to the members.

## **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

No comments.

## **FUTURE MEETING DATE**

## **FUTURE MEETING AGENDA ITEMS**

- Centennial Brochure—Jim Garrison
- Centennial Medallions—Beth Vershure

## **CLOSING COMMENTS**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Garrison adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

## ***MEETING HANDOUTS:***

- *Centennial Legacy Projects Budget/Match Detail and draft letter*
- *SB 1114 (Chapter 250)*
- *9-11 Memorial Literal Narrative of Historical Events*
- *Comments on the historical facts in the 11/20/2007 revisions to the proposed introductory panel narrative for 9-11 memorial from David Tatum*
- *Report on Historic Sites Review Committee activities dated November 26, 2007*
- *Treasurer's Report*